DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 297 415 EA 018 722

AUTHOR Hall, Gene E.; Hord, Shirley M.
TITLE Configurations of School-Based Leadership Teams.
INSTITUTION Texas Univ., Austin. Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, DC.
REPORT NO R&DCTE-3223
PUB DATE 86
GRANT NIE-G-83-0006
NOTE 36p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Change Strategies; Elementary Secondary Education; *Group Dynamics; *Instructional Leadership; Intervention; Leadership Responsibility; *Leadership Styles; Linking Agents; *Management Teams; *Principals; School Effectiveness; Teamwork
IDENTIFIERS *Facilitators

ABSTRACT

In this paper a new conception of leadership for change is proposed--that of change facilitating leadership teams that are characterized by roles, functions, and team dynamics. As an introduction, the conventional descriptions of leadership in the literature are briefly cited. This is followed by a summary of recent studies and observations focused on the functions of leadership. Building on this work and on the results of our recent research on school principals as change facilitators, the concept of change facilitator teams is presented. Recent research findings and brief examples are used to illustrate the different configurations of school-based leadership teams, their organization and operations. Included are 27 references and 3 figures. (Author)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED297415

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

CONFIGURATIONS OF SCHOOL-BASED LEADERSHIP TEAMS

Gene E. Hall
Shirley M. Hord

(R&D Report 3223)

1986

Grant Number: NIE-G-83-0006

The research described herein was conducted under contract with the National Institute of Education. The opinions expressed are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the National Institute of Education, and no endorsement by the National Institute of Education should be inferred.

EA 018 722

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CONFIGURATIONS OF SCHOOL-BASED LEADERSHIP TEAMS

Abstract

In this paper a new conception of leadership for change is proposed -- that of change facilitating leadership teams that are characterized by roles, functions, and team dynamics. As an introduction, the conventional descriptions of leadership in the literature are briefly cited. This is followed by a summary of recent studies and observations focused on the functions of leadership. Building on this work and on the results of our recent research on school principals as change facilitators, the concept of change facilitator teams is presented. Recent research findings and brief examples are used to illustrate the different configurations of school-based leadership teams, their organization and operations.

CONFIGURATIONS OF SCHOOL-BASED LEADERSHIP TEAMS[1,2]

Gene E. Hall and Shirley M. Hord

Research and Development Center for Teacher Education
The University of Texas at Austin

During the past few years national attention and numerous studies have explored the role of school principals. Much of the resultant reports, policies and recommendations focus on the principals' management and administrative functions. An example is Martin and Willower's (1981) study of high school principals from which they depict the principals' behavior in organizational maintenance, administration of the instructional program, pupil control, and extra curricular activities. A smaller, but growing, subset of the literature addresses what principals do in school change efforts. This part of the literature on principals has been reviewed and synthesized as well (e.g., Fullan, 1982; Leithwood & Montgomery, 1982; Rutherford, Hord, Huling, & Hall, 1983). Almost without exception the principal is portrayed as the single individual who provides varying degrees of leadership and facilitation to teachers as their schools undertake change and school improvement.

Thus, it was with surprise that we and our colleagues at the Research and Development Center for Teacher Education (R&DCTE), while intently

---

[1]The research described herein was conducted under contract with the National Institute of Education. The opinions expressed are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the National Institute of Education and no endorsement by the National Institute of Education should be inferred.

[2]The authors wish to acknowledge the secondary data analysis contributions of Dr. Justice Noruwana, University of Bophuthatsana, South Africa (visiting scholar at R&DCTE), and Jan Elen and Jan van Acoleyen of the Katholieke University, Leuven, Belgium (student fellows at R&DCTE).

studying the role of elementary school principals, found another actor, the Second Change Facilitator (2nd CF) (Hord, Stiegelbauer, & Hall, 1984), and sometimes a 3rd CF, working with principals to facilitate implementation of new curricular programs. With less surprise but reinforced interest, the R&DCTE change researchers found these key "others" again in subsequent studies of the change process in high schools (Huling-Austin, Stiegelbauer, & Muscella, 1985).

In an effort to better understand the working relationships and roles of these leaders as a set, we have re-examined our data bases, re-reviewed the literature and held extensive discussions with our research and practitioner colleagues. We used our long established process of staff meeting discussions to test alternative interpretations and conceptualizations of the phenomena. Out of these activities has emerged a better understanding of the emphasis upon the singular significance of the principal, and the importance of considering change facilitating teams rather than individual(s). Using our new analyses and those of our colleagues at the University of Oregon, we propose a third dimension or cluster of variables, team "dynamics," that we believe is the essential force that ties together role and functions to make school-based leadership teams work.

In making this proposal we briefly review the traditional manner of characterizing the leadership role, summarize the recent work on functions of leadership, and describe the third dimension of team dynamics. In proposing this conception we will use the results of recent research and model building and some brief examples to illustrate how the different configurations of school-based leadership teams are organized and operate. The examples illustrate leadership team effectiveness that range from optimal to less effective. Thus, we offer an alternative set of explanations for the varying

degrees of implementation success and school effectiveness that are regularly described in studies, observed in practice, and addressed in policy initiatives.

Different Conceptions and a New Organizing Framework

One of the reasons that past research on leadership has not provided more direct and specific suggestions for practice is that the understanding of leadership has been so limited that it was not possible to develop coherent frameworks and practical prescriptions. With the addition of more recent studies there now may be sufficient knowledge, systematically developed out of observations in real life settings, and grounded conceptual work to develop models and draw implications for practice that have increased validity, understandability and practicality.

In addition to Rutherford, Hord, Huling, and Hall's (1983) review of the standard sources of leadership literature, other key sources of information have played a part in the development of the concepts and frameworks to be described. The first includes the extensive field experiences and data bases that have been developed in our research during the last 15 years. These data bases include the early longitudinal study of over 400 teachers and 400 college professors who were involved in implementing educational innovations. The data base also includes our more recent ethnographic studies and detailed behavioral studies of school principals and others as they were involved in facilitating the change process. These studies have been done in elementary and secondary schools, as well as colleges and universities. More recently the concepts have been applied in the private sector as well.

From our point of view there is not a single leader role. There are multiple functions that must be accomplished and the key to this accomplishment has to do with the dynamic that occurs between two or more

individuals who have varying degrees of formal leadership responsibility. The functions needed for successful change are accomplished through the combined efforts of this team of change facilitators, rather than all being done individually by the formal head (i.e., principal). In the remainder of this paper our thinking about roles, functions and team dynamics are described and examples and implications illustrated.

The Leader Role

The organizational literature on leadership (e.g., Bass, 1981; Schein, 1985) is voluminous and heavily concentrated on an analysis of formal leaders. What is interesting in reviewing this literature is the single focus upon the leader and his or her leadership actions. Across the years it seems as if every attribute, characteristic, and activity of leaders has been examined and attempts have been made to correlate these with other variables that are in some way associated with success or effectiveness. The perceptions of leaders and others have been assessed, demographics have been compiled, mail baskets monitored and diaries maintained, yet there has been little success in identifying consistent patterns and stable variables that predict individual leader effectiveness.

Similar studies and findings have been reported in the educational administration literature as well. For example, the recent research on school effectiveness has added further to the emphasis upon the importance of the school principal as the leader. The work of Edmonds (1979), Venezky and Winfield (1979), and Leithwood and Montgomery (1982) provide ample evidence and summaries of the relationship of the role of the principal to school effectiveness. One of the more important and fruitful steps in the recent writings on leadership in education has been the return to an examination of a clustering of principal behaviors and analysis of "style." Such examinations

have resulted in reports that associate the overall pattern of school leader behavior with meaningful differences in school effectiveness and change success (Hall, Rutherford, Hord, & Huling, 1984; Leithwood, Ross, Montgomery, & Maynes, 1978; Thomas, 1978).

In research on change facilitator styles we identified three distinctive styles: the Initiator, the principal who has strongly held vision and works actively to support the school in moving toward attainment of that vision; the Manager style principal, who places heavy emphasis and a high level of activity on operating a smooth and efficient organization; and the Responder style principal, who is more concerned with issues of the present, and with the feelings and perceptions of teachers, staff, and others in relation to change. In this research and the study of these three different styles, a clear and systematic relationship was observed between particular styles of the school principal and implementation success (Huling, Hall, Hord, & Rutherford, 1983). It was observed that the Initiator and Manager style principals were associated with teachers who had higher degrees of success in implementation of new curriculum programs than those associated with principals using the Responder style.

Clearly in industry, education, and the change literature, there is a leader role and at least in some ways the role of the leader is associated with other variables that are considered to be important. However, there continues to be a general dissatisfaction with the research on leaders since it has been fairly difficult to identify singular factors that are consistently associated with leader effectiveness. This unrest in part may explain the recent movement of some educational researchers to more closely examine the functions of leadership.

Functions of Leadership

One of the key differences in these recent studies is the separation of the functions that are accomplished from the actor(s) who are in particular leadership positions. "Our view is that it is less important who performs the functions in a school than it is to what extent the functions are performed" (Gersten & Carnine, 1981, p. 20). "We do not mean to imply that unique leadership functions can be ascribed to each educator role in a district. The functions clearly overlap roles" (Gall, Fielding, Schalock, Charters, & Wilczynski, 1984, p. 127). In our own research and analysis of interventions (Hord, Huling, & Stiegelbauer, 1983) we assumed that interventions were done by a large number of actors, not just the school principal. We further assumed that it was possible to develop generic descriptions of these interventions that were not tied to specific actors or role groups.

Gersten and Carnine (1981) in their study of implementation of effective programs for low income students argued that there were some common functions that needed to occur if the change process was to be successful.

> Nevertheless, given a clearly defined innovation and a specific strategy for change, one can derive from the existing literature a listing of those behaviors and policies of administrators and supervisors that appear to be necessary for innovations to be implemented and sustained. (p. 21).

Gersten and Carnine call these "support" functions and they identify five which are summarized in Figure 1.

In an associated set of studies, Gall et al. (1984) did a retrospective analysis of their study of the involvement of principals in teachers' staff development activities and identified a set of "leadership" functions that they found to be associated with implementation and effectiveness of the staff development programs. Their nominated leadership functions are listed in Figure 1 as well.

In our studies of the change process we strove to develop a generic classification system for clustering and coding the interventions (those actions and events that influence the change process) made by the change facilitators. In this work we hypothesized that the quantity and quality of interventions would be a significant explainer of change process successes and failures. The framework is an Intervention Taxonomy (Hall & Hord, 1984); it proposes that various individual interventions (e.g., incidents) cluster together into an "Intervention Game Plan." We and our colleagues were able to cluster interventions functionally in the Intervention Taxonomy around a set of six Game Plan Components (GPCs) which were found to be generic across a number of sites and a number of studies. The GPCs are listed in Figure 1.

In reviewing the different lists of functions summarized in Figure 1, it is clear that there is a large amount of similarity and overlap. In each of the studies that have been referred to, the authors can point out significant relationships between the existence of these functions and success in change processes. Thus, it is possible to associate change process success and effectiveness variables to functions that are done, independently of who does them.

Change Facilitator Teams

This brief summary of research and theory about the role of individual leaders and the generic leadership functions represents several contemporary perspectives and understandings. However, these two vectors, of roles and functions, do not represent the whole picture of leadership for change that we have been observing and documenting. There are some remaining gaps that are hinted at in the recent literature, and in the discussions between us and our colleagues. For example, one of the consistent points of discussion in the recent work in Texas and at the University of Oregon, is that "principals

don't do it alone." There is a regular reference to the fact that other people within schools and indeed that persons in the district office (Hall, Putman, & Hord, 1985) make interventions that affect what goes on within schools. In other work (Goodwin & Lieberman, 1985; Saxl & Miles, 1985), the concept of the role of "assisters" (Miles, Farrar, & Neufeld, 1983) has been proposed. In these studies a number of facilitators have been observed to influence the change process, and they work together.

The conventional emphasis on the principal as the leader was a part of the research plan for our first major examination of the role of the school principal as change facilitator. In the Principal-Teacher Interaction Study (Hall, Hord, Goldstein, Rutherford, Newlove, Huling, & Griffin, 1982; Hall, Hord, Huling, Rutherford, & Stiegelbauer, 1983), the original design was to document systematically the intervention behaviors of school principals and to trace their effects in terms of implementation success on teachers in classrooms. As the study unfolded, the idea of change facilitating teams emerged. In CF Teams there are special roles and role relationships, shared functions and a unique dynamic that results in leadership for change as an encompassing ether that permeates the school building. This occurs as a result of teams rather than simply from what the principal does.

CF Team Membership

As data collection began in the PTI Study, it became immediately apparent in all nine study sites that there was at least one other person, in addition to the principal, who was making a significant number of interventions. This second person was not necessarily the assistant principal or a person that was officially recognized in an organizational chart as having extra responsibility or authority. Changes were made in the study design to follow this other person(s) as well.

In time this person became known as the "Second Change Facilitator" or "consigliere" (Hord, Stiegelbauer, & Hall, 1984). There were some indications in some of the more active school sites that there was a Third CF who played a part. Most of these Second and Third CFs were located within schools but others were located in the central office. As acceptance of these other change facilitators increased, later data collection and analysis steps included examination of the interrelationships between these various change facilitators and the activities (i.e., interventions) that each did. This work led to the conclusion that there is a leadership team structure that occurs in schools where the change process is progressing in successful ways.

Although there was little, if any, official recognition of the multiple actors who were serving on this change facilitator team, a pattern of relationships was observed in those schools where the change process was more successful. In those schools there was a weighting of responsibility and work assignments that resulted in role differentiation between the first, second, and third change facilitators and a dynamic interaction that made the team greater than the simple summary of the individual facilitators.

Team Functions

Through an analysis of the data and extensive discussions with colleagues, a set of change facilitating team functions has been identified. These functions are summarized in Figure 1, also. The identification of these CF Team Functions emerged from reviewing the descriptive and quantitative data in the R&DCTE data bases, additional analyses of audio tape interviews of teachers and school-based and district office leaders, focused debriefings of field research staff, and intensive staff discussion of proposed function names, definitions and relationships to data interpretations.

The identified CF Team Functions have many parallels with the functions identified in the other studies summarized in Figure 1. It seems likely that with some additional study it will be possible to propose one generic set of functions that must be addressed by the change leadership as the process unfolds. This list will be useful in planning for change, in guiding interpretation of future data sets and could provide the basis for specialized change facilitator training. One way to portray these CF Team Functions is to identify who in the school does each function and relate their assignments to change process effectiveness. These various functions that have been identified for change facilitating teams are distributed across the different change facilitator roles and in more successful change efforts there is a clear pattern of how responsibility for these different functions is assumed. This pattern is described later in this paper.

CF Team Dynamic

First, this third dimension must be described. In doing this it must be emphasized that the teaming described here is different from what has been traditionally reflected in the leadership literature. For example, in the organizational literature on leadership Bass (1981) and Schein (1985) report primarily on the single leader and his/her leadership actions or on participative leadership in which decision making and problem solving are shared with everyone in the organization. The idea of two or three leaders joining in leadership team activities was not found in this literature.

In the educational leadership literature, Wilhelm (1984) talks about the "building [level] team." But this is in the same sense as Bass and Schein, that is, all members of the faculty, plus parents, plus students, become involved in a "flatly" structured decision making formulation.

In their recent work, Glatthorn and Newberg (1984) talk about a team approach in the sense that a number of actors within a high school are involved in leadership, however, their emphasis is placed upon a formal allocation of leadership functions.

> With a team approach, the critical functions of curriculum and instructional leadership are assigned to those on a staff most capable of performing them rather than being centralized in a principal's office. (p. 63).

Glatthorn and Newberg's emphasis upon the distribution of functions is consistent with what we are talking about in terms of school-based leadership teams. However, in the implied formalization of the assignment of duties to be carried out and in the implication that a single individual is responsible for a function, there are differences. The lack of subsequent interaction and sharing of function assignments is not consistent with the configuration of CF Teams being described here.

In change facilitating teams there is a vibrant, dynamic, and interactive force that holds together the roles and functions. This is the third dimension that can be used to conceptualize and to characterize the CF Teams. The characteristics of this team dynamic include the following:

1. Role differentiation. Each member of the CF Team assumes a different role (First CF, Second CF, Third CF, External CFs). They will vary depending upon the particular skills and interests of each member of the team and the combined needs and mission of the team. One of the keys in this role differentiation is that, in combination, the array of CF Team functions are covered. This "covering" is not typically done by one team member assuming full responsibility for a particular function, but rather through a sharing and overlapping of role assignments. At the same time there is a clear order to the degree of responsibility and authority that

each team member has relative to each other in terms of facilitating the change effort. The general pattern to this delineation is as follows:

First CF has primary responsibility for facilitating the change process.

Second CF works closely with the First CF and users to advance use of the innovation.

Third CF assists Second CF in planning, monitoring and consulting with users.

2. Goal clarity. Members share a common view of the aims and steps for achieving success in the change effort. This does not mean everyone is in 100% agreement with the directions nor that each has a detailed picture. There may be some flexibility in terms of degree of support and in terms of depth of understanding. However, there is no basic disagreement with the directions of the change process and there is clarity about goals and objectives.

3. Open planning. The planning for the change process is readily shared and discussed among all members of the change facilitating team and interested others. The planning process is ongoing and one that is constantly reviewed and revised through various forms of informal conversations; as well as regularly scheduled team planning times.

4. Accuracy of information transfer. Due to the style of the team members and their regular and active communication about process and planning, information exchange among the change facilitator team members and with the various clients of the change process is shared in ways that are timely and accurate. One of the consequences of this is less misinterpretation and misleading rumors floating around the client system.

5. Interaction. The members of the change facilitator team

are in continuous contact with each other and with members of the client system. There is a high frequency of contact and interaction among various dyads and the team as a whole. Most of these contacts are short and of the "one-legged" variety.

6. Continuity. Actions, decisions and planning are done with a picture of the totality of the effort in mind. There is an interrelatedness and consistency of actions as they are planned and carried out by the various change facilitators.

7. Collegiality. The team members work with each other in an ongoing collegial, professional interchange. The formality of the chain of command within the team and in terms of the larger organizational structure is understood. At the same time, within the functioning of the change facilitator team, there is a professional collegiality that not only allows for, but encourages dialogue about the plans and actions of the team through open discussion and mutual professional respect.

8. Adding together. There is sufficient knowledge and communication among the various members of the change facilitating team and a shared agenda so that the actions and effects of each builds upon the actions and effects of the others. In this way, each member of the team gains from the work of fellow team members and the total change process has a greater whole than the simple addition of the efforts of each facilitator individually.

9. Positivism. The tone and expectations of the CF Team as individuals and collectively is one of positive professionalism and enthusiasm for the innovation, for the capabilities of the school and for the activities that are taking place. This dynamic of looking on

the positive side and thinking about opportunities rather than disadvantages permeates the activities of an effective CF Team.

10. Complementarity. There is clear knowledge among the various change facilitators of what each is capable of doing. The consequence of this is the potential for complementarity through increasing and using the strengths that each has and decreasing individual emphasis on particular functions. There is a willing filling of gaps and anticipation of what each other will be doing.

The traditional literature has offered extensive analyses of the individual leader role. More recently there have been reports of analyses of the various functions that need to be accomplished in order to have successful change. In this paper the concept of Change Facilitating Teams is proposed. There is not just one change facilitator, but a team of change facilitators and there is a vibrant interaction between the various members of this CF Team. Further, there is a differentiation of role and responsibility among the members of the change facilitating team and it is through this collective leadership that change and school improvement occurs.

By returning to our interview tapes and field notes, it has been possible to identify key characteristics of the first, second, and third change facilitators and the relative weighting of each in accomplishing the change process functions. In the next section of this paper the results of these analyses are introduced.

Characteristics and Functions of Successful Change Facilitating Teams

The importance of the CF Team as a dynamic interactive force for leadership and change cannot be overemphasized. It is not simply having more than one leader with delegated authority and responsibility. It is not

a matter of the presence or absence of formal positions within the organization, time allocations, degree of skill or aptitude. What is being described is a highly interactive, collegial, dynamic organism that has a life of its own within the ongoing process of the organization. Developing descriptions of this team dynamic that can bring it to life and place it in its unique relationship with the concepts of individual leader role and functions is extremely difficult. Perhaps an analogy will be instructive.

The analogy is the combining of atoms to form molecules. Each atom has its own characteristics such that hydrogen has its own observable properties that are distinct from other gases, such as oxygen. When oxygen and hydrogen are combined chemically they form water, a material with a new set of properties. Each atom of hydrogen and oxygen still has its individual identity but in combination as a molecule of water a new set of distinctive properties replace, for the time being, the individual atomic properties.

In the change facilitating team, a similar phenomenon is at work. The individual atoms can be thought of as being equivalent to the individual change facilitators that make up the team. The first change facilitator may be a hydrogen atom and the second change facilitator, an oxygen atom. In combination the team becomes a molecule of water with many new properties.

Another aspect of molecular chemistry and physics becomes important to this analogy. The combining and holding together of various atoms requires force. There are different kinds of forces in nature; magnetism and gravity are two of the better known. Interestingly, in atomic physics there is another force which defies simple explanation. It is a different kind of force that we are trying to represent in the concept of team dynamic.

The force that combines the first, second and other change facilitators into a change facilitating team is the team dynamic. It is not the same

phenomenon as roles or functions. It is a third set of phenomena that needs to be understood since the effective change facilitating team is different in form, function and process from the actions of the individual facilitators that make it up, just as the properties of water are different from the properties and characteristics of the individual atoms of hydrogen and oxygen that make up that molecule.

To push the analogy one step further, with different atoms and different combinations of atoms different molecules result. There is an almost infinite variety of chemical combinations possible. The same is true in the development of change facilitating teams. There are many possible configurations of teams depending upon the characteristics of the various change facilitators who are part of them and the environment within which they are working. As a consequence, some configurations of teams are likely to be more effective for various reasons than are others. And, it is possible to begin to identify some of the characteristics of the structure of change facilitating teams and the functioning of these teams that are associated with more and less effectiveness.

A description of more optimal change facilitating teams has been developed by focusing on the more effective teams that have been observed in past studies. The descriptions that follow are based upon the optimal characteristics and distribution of functions as derived from the quantitative and qualitative data base, and experiences that we have had.

A summary of optimal characteristics of successful change facilitating teams for school-wide change efforts is presented in Figure 2. One of the first characteristics that is identified in this analysis and summary is that for optimal success in secondary, as well as elementary schools, the First CF should be the school principal. The change process can still

succeed when someone other than the principal is the First CF, but it is our opinion as well as the unanimous opinion of our colleagues that the optimal First CF is the principal. A second characteristic is that there is a Second CF. It does not appear to be necessary to have a Third CF always, although in more cases than not when there is a school-wide change effort, there will be someone serving in a Third CF role. Another key ingredient in the change facilitating team is that there is an array of individuals outside of the school who are "on call." From time to time they make significant interventions by addressing particular functions that they are especially trained to do or that the school-based team deemphasizes or cannot do. These "external CFs" represent a category of change facilitators who tend to flow in and out of the ongoing work of a particular change facilitating team.

As can be seen in Figure 2 there is a clear pattern to the differentiation of responsibility across team members and distinctions in status, recognition, relationships, expertise with the innovation and time spent in the change facilitating roles. This figure represents an estimate of the optimal conditions which very rarely will be matched. Instead, as we have observed in most situations, there are individual adjustments in the weightings of characteristics by roles. Once the weightings of the First CF are understood there is a balancing and shifting of assignments by the other team members. The typical pattern is for the Second CF to do those things that are being assumed less by the First CF, with the Third CF and External CFs filling in on some of the more obvious gaps left by the first two. As one moves to less optimal configurations of change facilitating teams, major gaps and omissions in terms of role characteristics of the different change facilitators can be observed.

An interesting observation is that the functioning of these various change facilitators is not consistent with traditional views of school leaders as resource allocators and evaluators. For example, in the studies of elementary school principals (Hall et al., 1982, 1983), it was observed that the principal as First CF did significantly more coaching and reinforcing type interventions with teachers than one might expect of the "typical" principal. And the second change facilitators did significantly more monitoring of implementation and making of resource allocation and scheduling decisions than would stereotypically be assumed for that role. To reiterate, the emphasis must be placed on the complementarity and interrelationships between the members of the change facilitating team. The objective is to determine if the different identified characteristics are available in a particular combination of people rather than searching for one person to do all things. The functions can be accomplished in a number of ways.

Another way to picture this is presented in Figure 3, which is a charting of the assignment of responsibility for change facilitating functions according to the various members of the change facilitating team. In this figure the nine different CF team functions for facilitating change are weighted according to the amount of activity of each member of the change facilitating team. These weightings were the result of consensus agreement among the seven member research team. As can be quickly observed in the figure, no function has been identified as being solely the responsibility of one particular change facilitator. Instead, all functions are shared across, with typically one of the change facilitators having greater emphasis, responsibility and activity in relation to each function. In general, the first change facilitator has the final responsibility for

carrying out the functions, with the second change facilitator being Second. In all instances where the First, Second and Third CFs are not accomplishing a particular function or particular activity within a function, then external change facilitators are needed to do these--in addition to doing those things which their particular expertise demands. The change facilitating team that is effectively functioning will address all of these functions and do it with the team dynamic insuring continuity and integration. It is through this combination of roles, functions and team dynamics that facilitation of the change process becomes so effective.

Illustrations of Different Configurations of Change Facilitating Teams

Brief illustrations of three CF teams follow. Note that each of the teams has a different style of principal -- manager, initiator, responder -- (Hall, Rutherford, Hord, & Huling, 1984) which we hypothesize accounts in a major way for the variance in how the teams are structured and in how the members interact.

Sun Harbour School Leadership Team (Manager Principal)

At Sun Harbour Elementary School the manager style principal has organized a team of three facilitators, two in addition to herself. The Second CF is the Assistant Principal, the Third CF is a special Primary Resource Teacher selected from the faculty for this role. The three team members meet weekly to have lunch and review the math program change effort in the school, and to make plans for immediate and future activities. When it is needed, they interact more frequently. From time to time the Math Coordinator/External CF is contacted by the Principal to come into the school for particular purposes, primarily for training teachers and for providing individualized technical assistance and coaching to them.

The Principal/First CF takes as much action in facilitating the new math curriculum as the Second CF and Third CF combined. Although a major focus of her activity is on resource provision, an additional activity is one that integrates monitoring, reinforcing and sanctioning the implementation of math. That is, her monitoring "speaks" to teachers to say that the Principal views the new math as an important priority and that she is solidly behind it. When her monitoring reveals teacher needs, this First CF contacts the Second or Third or External CF to request assistance. Thus, the Second and Third CFs are quite actively engaged in interactive, complex interventions with teachers as they serve as "coaches" to them. In these very active roles the Second CF and Third CF also utilize a substantial amount of their time in materials and resource acquisition for their teachers.

Thorncliffe Junior High Team for Facilitating Change (Initiator Principal)

The initiator style Principal/First CF at Thorncliffe provides the "push" function with teachers as they implement change in their classrooms. While the Assistant Principal served as an early Second CF for the effort, the First CF reorganized the teaching staff at one grade level to "free" one teacher in order to provide the whole faculty with a special innovation resource, a Third CF. The Third CF, who met regularly with the First and Second CF, provided reinforcing and coaching activities with teachers, including demonstrations of the program and team teaching in their classrooms. The Second CF held monitoring and planning conferences with teachers, while the First CF continued to keep faculty appraised of the new program's importance, used his time and energy for making resources continually available, and barred the district-level External CF from the school. The school's internal facilitators were seen as being more

influential with teachers than the external facilitator. This First CF Principal was comfortable with negotiating district-level innovation-related policies in his school when it appeared to be in the school's best interests. Teacher adaptations of the new program were also reviewed by the First CF for their appropriateness and sensitivity to student needs.

At Thorncliffe the facilitation activity was rather evenly balanced among each of the facilitators. Because they worked harmoniously with each other and also with a great deal of vigor and enthusiasm with teachers, implementation success at the classroom level was very high.

Laurel High School (Responder Principal)

The First CF/responder style Principal at Laurel High utilizes much of his time in public relations activities for the school. Thus, while he strongly sanctions use of the new/innovative procedures by teachers, he only gives a modest amount of time to other facilitating functions. This means that the Assistant Principal/Second CF and External CF, curriculum coordinator, strive to provide the major fulfillment of the functions. Reinforcement is provided by the External CF, since he lacked the power and influence to provide stronger forms of "push." Both the Second CF and External CF are available to teachers as resources and for coaching, but the monitoring which necessarily precedes coaching is not well provisioned. Regular coordination of effort among the facilitators and planning for filling the functions is not present. Therefore, facilitation is sporadic and "spotty" at best. Predictably, implementation of the change was less successful in this school.

Discussion and Implications

In this paper characteristics and dimensions of leadership teams for facilitating change in elementary and secondary schools have been presented. One of the underlying premises has been that the context of elementary or secondary schools does not diminish the importance of the change facilitating team. Another underylying premise in this analysis has been the facilitating of school-wide change efforts. Configuring change facilitation for an individual department would mean a different set of actors. However, it is still likely that there will be First and Second CFs and that in those departments where the team dynamic is stronger, the change process will be more successful. We have assumed that the innovations were appropriate.

A few brief points of summary and discussion of implications are offered in conclusion.

Principals Are Not Alone

Effective principals don't do it alone; they are part of a team of change facilitators. Greater emphasis needs to be given to the importance of having second and third change facilitator roles. The extensive literature in education, organization and industrial psychology have provided characteristics, attributes and practices of the primary leaders, who in most cases will be the First CFs. Much less is known about informal and in most cases unrecognized roles of Second and Third CFs. Even less is known about the dynamics of the change facilitating team. We do know that it is not sufficient to simply identify First, Second and Third CFs. The CF team dynamic has to be operating to pull together and make the greater whole.

Concommitantly the identification and allocation of responsibility for accomplishing key functions by itself will not suffice. The CF team has to share in complementary ways in accomplishing the change facilitating functions. How these functions are allocated and shared, the characteristics of the constant interaction, the maintenance of equilibrium within a CF team, and other attributes of this ongoing process are little understood.

There are a number of settings in which school principals and their change facilitating team colleagues are setting exemplary examples of how a CF Team can function and make a difference. It is these less typical situations that should be the subject of more study. Learning how to change the typical settings so that it is possible to have more optimal change facilitating team configurations is a worthy topic for study as well.

Think Team/Team Think

The concept and functioning of the team dynamic has to be studied further. What are the details of the characteristics of the different members of a change facilitating team? How does the team dynamic get established and nurtured? What kinds of interventions and adaptations are needed to shift existing teams to CF team configurations that would be more effective and optimal? Within a team the various functions are shared and accomplished in complementary ways. What are the elements of this complementarity? And what are the details of how decisions are reached about who does what? There has to be some underlying structuring that acknowledges the talents, interests, capabilities and targets of opportunity that make up the CF team. Understanding more about the team dynamic may lead to ways to structure and organize future CF teams to obtain more optimal configurations.

The Essentiality of External CFs

In other recent work (Hall, Putman, & Hord, 1985), we have begun to examine the role of district office personnel in relation to the facilitation of change in schools. It is clear in that work, as well as charted in this paper, that these and other external change facilitators play an essential role in the school-based CF team. It appears that various individual External CFs enter and exit the CF team as a change process unfolds. As various tasks within particular CF functions arise, External CFs are called upon. All of the talent, resources and knowledge cannot reside within the First, Second and Third CF. The External CFs in their temporary support roles on these CF teams contribute in enumerable ways. Much more needs to be understood about the role of these External CFs, their placement, their knowledge, their entry, their exit. For example, in a number of situations district office personnel have been essential to the success of school-based change efforts, although, in a number of situations External CFs have been barred by school members from making needed contributions to the change process. The best ways to capitalize upon the potential of External CFs and to utilize them in ways that are complementary to the local CF team are not always obvious. This is another area in which further study and theory building is in order.

In Conclusion

Perhaps some of the most relevant findings from recent studies of practitioners, who are attempting to accomplish all of the mandates and respond to needs in their schools, is that no one individual educator is responsible for accomplishing all of the various functions that are being identified. The principal should not be isolated individually and expected to be responsible for 100% of the activity and variance that occurs within

his/her school any more than individual teachers should. Clearly, the principal as an individual can be associated with a great deal of variance in terms of change process success in school effectiveness. However, the configurations of change facilitating teams can also be associated with varying degrees of school success. Instead of isolating individuals and placing full responsibility upon them, it would seem that in research, policy and practice initiatives more attention should be given to the accumulating effects of each individual as they compliment the work of others.

Education is a human enterprise and one that is clearly the result of the work and contributions of many. New ways need to be developed to describe the interactive and collective effects that a team of change facilitators can and do make, and less attention should be given to isolated individual roles. They don't do it alone. We now need to look more closely at how they do it together.

References

Bass, B. M. (1981). Stogdill's handbook of leadership (A survey of theory and research). New York: The Free Press.

Edmonds, R. (1979). Effective schools for the urban poor. Educational Leader, 37, 15-24.

Fullan, M. (1982). The meaning of educational change. New York: Teachers College Press.

Gall, M. D., Fielding, G., Schalock, D., Charters, Jr., W. W., & Wilczynski, J. M. (1984). Involving the principal in teachers' staff development: Effects on the quality of mathematics instruction in elementary schools. Eugene: Center for Educational Policy and Management, University of Oregon.

Gersten, R., & Carnine, D. (1981). Administrative and supervisory support functions for the implementation of effective educational programs for low income students. Eugene: Center for Educational Policy and Management, University of Oregon.

Glatthorn, A. A., & Newberg, N. A. (1984). A team approach to instructional leadership. Educational Leadership, 41(5), 60-63.

Goodwin, A. L., & Lieberman, A. (1985, April). Effective assister behavior: What they brought and what they learned. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.

Hall, G. W., & Hord, S. M. (1984). Analyzing what change facilitators do: The intervention taxonomy. Knowledge, Creation, Diffusion, Utilization, 5(3), 275-307.

Hall, G. E., Hord, S. M., Goldstein, M. L., Rutherford, W. L., Newlove, B. W., Huling, L. L., & Griffin, T. H. (1982, March). Principals as change facilitators: Their interventions. Symposium conducted at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York.

Hall, G. E., Hord, S. M., Huling, L. L., Rutherford, W. L., & Stiegelbauer, S. M. (1983, April). Leadership variables associated with successful school improvement. Symposium conducted at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, Canada.

Hall, G. E., Putman, S., & Hord, S. M. (1985, April). District office personnel: Their roles and influence on school and classroom change: What we don't know. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.

Hall, G. E., Rutherford, W. L., Hord, S. M., & Huling, L. L. (1984, February). Effects of the three principal styles on school improvement. Educational Leadership, 22-29.

Hord, S. M., Huling, L. L., & Stiegelbauer, S. M. (1983). An analysis of interventions in school improvement efforts (R&D Rep. 3156). Austin: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas at Austin.

Hord, S.M. & Huling-Austin, L. (forthcoming). Effective curriculum implementation: Some promising new insights. Elementary School Journal.

Hord, S. M., Stiegelbauer, S. M., & Hall, G. E. (1984). How principals work with other change facilitators. Education and Urban Society, 17(1), 89-109.

Huling, L. L., Hall, G. E., Hord, S. M., & Rutherford, W. L. (1983). A multi-dimensional approach for assessing implementation success (R&D Rep. 3157). Austin: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas at Austin.

Huling-Austin, L. L., Stiegelbauer, S. M., & Muscella, D. (1985, April). High school principals: Their role in guiding change. In Changing the American high school: Descriptions and prescriptions. Symposium conducted at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.

Leithwood, K A., & Montgomery, D. (1982). The role of the elementary school principal in program improvement. Review of Educational Research, 52(3), 309-339.

Leithwood, K A., Ross, J., Montgomery, D., & Maynes, F. (1978). An empirical investigation of teacher's curriculum decision-making processes and strategies used by curriculum decision managers to influence such decision making. Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

Martin, W. J., & Willower, D. J. (1981). The managerial behavior of high school principals. Educational Administration Quarterly, 17(1), 69-90.

Miles, M. B., Farrar, E., & Neufeld, B. (1983). The extent of adoption of effective schools programs. In Review of effective schools programs (Vol. II). Cambridge, MA: Huron Institute.

Rutherford, W. L., Hord, S. M., Huling, L. L., & Hall, G. E. (1983). Change facilitators: In search of understanding their role (R&D Rep. 3159). Austin: The Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas at Austin.

Saxl, E. R., & Miles, M. B. (1985, April). 'The real thing': What skills do effective change agents need? Some preliminary findings from the field. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.

Schein, E. H. (1985). Organizational culture and leadership. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Thomas, M. A. (1978). A study of alternatives in American education, Vol. II: The role of the principal. Santa Monica, CA: The Rand Corporation.

Venezky, R., & Winfield, L. (1979). Schools that succeed beyond expectations in teaching reading. Newark: University of Delaware.

Wilhelm, P. M. (1984). The administration team, a simple concept to facilitate problem solving. NASSP Bulletin, 68(468), 26-31.

Figure 1

Identified Functions for Effective Leadership

Gersten & Carnine (1981) Support Functions	Gall et al. (1984) Instructional Leadership Functions	Hall & Hord (1984) Intervention Game Plan Components	Hall & Hord (1986) Change Facilitating Team Functions
visible commitment	priority setting	developing supportive organizational arrangements	sanctioning/ continued back up
monitoring	resource acquisition	training	providing resources
technical assistance	monitoring	providing consultation and reinforcement	technical coaching
incentive systems	compliance	monitoring and evaluation	monitoring/ follow up
explicit strategies	training	external communication	training
	instructional policy-making	dissemination	reinforcing
	assessment		pushing
	external relations		telling others
	maintenance		approving adaptations

Figure 2

Optimal Characteristics of Successful Change Facilitating Teams for School-Wide Change

Innovation Related Characteristics	First CF (principal)	Second CF (necessary)	Third CF (optional)	External CFs
Primary Assignment	Not in classroom.	In school, but not in classroom with special CF role.	In classroom.	External to school.
Time Allocation	Spends much time.	Has as major part of job.	Spends small part of their time on CF role.	Full time or part time.
Authority	Has formal authority in line or staff position.	Has less authority than first CF.	Little or no formal authority.	Heavy responsibility with varying authority.
Orientation	Sees use of innovation as being important.	Truly believes that the innovation is good and should be used.	Is enthusiastic but not blind to the less practical parts.	Concerned about overall picture.
Role	Push for use, leads CF team.	Day-to-day coach, helper.	Supportive, back-up to 1st and 2nd CF, opinion leader among user colleagues.	Fills in on key functions.
Innovation Expertise	Knowledgeable of and skilled in manipulating resources to support the innovation.	Expert in technical details of innovation use.	Knowledgeable of details in use and sensitive to local conditions that affect use.	Detail or general.

Figure 2, continued

Innovation Related Characteristics	First CF (principal)	Second CF (necessary)	Third CF (optional)	External CFs
Time Perspective and Tone	Impatient to have results so can get on to other things.	Has patience to do day-to-day problem-solving, hand-holding, cajoling and coaching.	Calm and comfortable about innovation use; willing to take time to help others.	Longer term with desire for major success.
Innovation Priority	First or very near top of the list.	Is their major priority.	Not all consuming, or first priority, but important.	Sees as important.
Recognition	Success comes from having implementation and successful outcomes.	More internally oriented, not so interested in extra recognition or glory, but wants on-going support to do what s/he believes has to be done to help users.	Gets recognition from their regular role, but willing to help out when asked.	Implementation and outcomes are important.
Relationship Between Team Members	Leads, listens, decides.	Communicates, shares, supports.	Listens, suggests, follows through.	Drops in and out.
Team Dynamics	Ongoing cross member exchange, mutual support and complimentarity of emphases, characteristics and functions.			

Figure 3

The Importance of Who Does What for Successful Change

	Change Facilitating Team Members			
	First CF (principal)	Second CF	Third CF	External CFs
C.F. FUNCTIONS				
1. Sanctioning/ continued back up	xxxx	xx		xx
2. Providing resources	xxx	xx		x
3. Technical coaching	x	xx	x	x
4. Monitoring/ follow up	xx	xx	x	
5. Training	x	x		xx
6. Reinforcing	xx	xxx	x	x
7. Pushing	xx	xx	x	x
8. Telling others	xx	x		x
9. Approving adaptations	xx	x		x

Legend:

x, xx, xxx, xxxx = Degree of importance

From: Hall, G. E. & Hord, S. M. Change in schools: Facilitating the process. Albany, New York: State University of New York Press, 1986.